

REMARKS

Claims 13-19, 21 and 23-37 are now in this application.

By this amendment claims 13-15, 17-19, 24, 25 and 37 have been modified so that they better define the invention.

In the advisory Action of October 16, 2008, the examiner made comments that the claims and arguments were not commensurate with each other, and further the examiner implied that he may have suggestions as to how the claims might be amended to overcome the rejections. If so, any such suggestions by the examiner would be greatly appreciated.

In the Final Office action the examiner rejected claims 13, 14, 22-27 and 29-36 as anticipated by Bessiere. However, it is pointed out that Bessiere does not teach the structure as recited in claim 13, and also does not teach the structure as recited in claim 37. In particular, Bessiere does not teach a differential pressure chamber which controls a pressure amplifier, which is now clearly recited in the claims.

And further, without teaching a differential pressure chamber, Bessiere cannot possibly include any teaching of a bore which connects the differential pressure chamber to a control valve so that the control valve can actuate the pressure amplifier.

Accordingly, the rejection of any of the claims under 35 USC 102 clearly is not proper, because the reference to Bessiere does not teach all of the structure which is recited in the claims.

As the examiner is probably aware, a differential pressure chamber is a part of a pressure amplifier. Bessiere does not in any way teach such a pressure amplifier, and certainly does not teach a differential pressure chamber.

And further, the claims go on to recite that the control line leads to a valve that actuates the pressure amplifier by subjecting the differential pressure chamber to pressure or relieves it from such pressure. Since Bessiere does not include any such structure, clearly a rejection under 35 USC 102 would not be proper.

The examiner has rejected claim 25 under 35 USC 102, explaining that somehow he is reading Bessiere's extension 6a of chamber 6 as being as an encompassing groove in the cylindrical wall of the cylindrical chamber. This reading clearly is not warranted. Area 6a cannot be considered as anything other than an extension from the bottom, flat wall of chamber 6. It is clearly not a pocket or encompassing groove in the **cylindrical** wall of the cylindrical chamber.

While applicants certainly do not believe that area 6a of Bessiere can be considered to be a modification of the cylindrical wall, if somehow the examiner still insists in considering area 6a as being a modification of the cylindrical wall, then it is pointed out that the examiner must also consider that such area 6a would in fact be a protrusion from the cylindrical wall, not a groove in it as recited by claim 25. The cylindrical wall which forms area 6a has smaller diameter than the cylindrical wall which forms area 6. With this relationship, the cylindrical wall of area 6a thus extends inwardly from the cylindrical wall which forms area 6. Thus it cannot be considered to be a groove or recess in the cylindrical wall of area 6. If the examiner still considers it to be a modification of the cylindrical wall of area 6, then it must rather be considered to a protrusion from the cylindrical wall of area 6.

Thus claim 25, and the claims which depend on it, recite structure which Bessiere does not have, and so a rejection under 35 USC 102 clearly is not appropriate.

Furthermore, there is no structure of record in any of the prior art which would lead one skilled in the art to consider placing a pocket in the cylindrical wall of Bessiere's chamber 6.

With regard to claim 33, the examiner has indicated that figure 1 of Bessiere indicates that the conduits 11 and 23 are of rectangular shape. The examiner's position on this point has no merit whatsoever. Contrary to the examiner's position, the cross section as shown in figure 1 of Bessiere does not indicate that conduits 11 and 23 are rectangular. The showing in figure 1 of Bessiere is appropriate for cylindrical bored conduits as well as for rectangular conduits. The showing in Bessiere is also appropriate for conduits of several other shapes as the showing in the figures of Bessiere is generic to many shapes. And Bessiere includes no recitation in the specification as to what shape conduits 11 and 23 should be. Since Bessiere has no disclosure with regard to what shape the conduits are, it is not a fair reading for the examiner to assume that the conduits of Bessiere are rectangular. Certainly the showing in the drawings of Bessiere is not adequate for anyone to properly assume that the conduits are rectangular. And therefor it is inappropriate for the examiner to reject claim 33 and the claims which depend on it under 35 USC 102, as there is no teaching in Bessiere of any rectangular shape.

As further evidence, it is requested that the examiner consider chamber 6, which Bessiere discloses as cylindrical. If the showing of chamber 6 is compared to the showing of conduits 11 and 23, the examiner will note that there is no difference, other than the size of the cylinder. Most often conduits such as 11 and 23, which are formed in a more or less solid block of

Appl. No. 10/560,911
Amdt. dated December 1, 2008
Pre-Amendment


material, are formed by a boring process which makes cylindrical bores with circular openings. It would take an extraordinary effort to make the conduits 11 and 23 of Bessiere rectangular, and for the examiner to somehow assume that they are rectangular is simply not a fair reading and interpretation of Bessiere.

Clearly then, it is not proper for the examiner to have rejected claim 33 under 35 USC 102 since there is no teaching in Bessiere of the conduits being either oval or rectangular.

With regard to claims 24 and 36, the examiner's statement of rejection is clearly wrong. In the device of Bessiere only one bore, 23, leads into chamber 6a. Bore 11 leads into bore 23. Thus Bessiere has no teaching of at least two bores leading into the pocket or groove, and so a rejection of these claims under 35 USC 102 clearly is not proper.

For all of the above reasons, whether singly or taken in combination with each other, entry of this amendment and allowance of the claims are courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald E. Greigg
Registration No. 31217
Attorney of Record

GREIGG & GREIGG, P.L.L.C.
1423 Powhatan Street, Suite One
Alexandria, VA 22314

Tel. (703) 838-5500
Fax. (703) 838-5554

REG/SLS/ncr

J:\Bosch\R306015\Pre-Amendment after RCE Filed.wpd